



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It is well settled that a publication, although not made in the presence of the court, which tends to interfere with the administration of justice by bringing the judge into disrepute, is contempt of court. *State v. Morrill*, 16 Ark. 384. See 1 BAILEY, HABEAS CORPUS, 218. Truth of the statement is no defense. *Paterson v. Colorado*, 205 U. S. 454. *Contra*, *McClatchy v. Superior Ct. of Sacramento Co.*, 119 Cal. 413, 51 Pac. 696. See 11 HARV. L. REV. 543. It can be argued that although the constitution gave the right to circulate the recall petition, that right, like the right of freedom of speech or of the press, must be exercised in such a manner as not to interfere with the administration of justice. See *State v. Morrill*, 16 Ark. 384, 403, 407. The argument, however, that the provision for recall necessarily and expressly provides for the publication of the grounds on which the recall is sought, and that such publication is therefore no contempt, seems more sound. It is no contempt for counsel to set forth in a petition for change of venue the bias of the judge before whom the case was called. *In re Smith*, 54 Col. 486, 131 Pac. 277. It has been held no contempt for a newspaper to call a judge running for re-election, corrupt and partial, although there were cases pending before him at the time. *State v. Circuit Ct. of Eau Claire Co.*, 97 Wis. 1, 72 N. W. 193. The constitutional provision that a judge may be put to an election at any time, coupled with the public interest in ascertaining the fitness of a person running for office, outweighs the public policy in favor of the uninterrupted administration of justice. The criticism that this results in the possibility of intimidating courts in the exercise of their duty must be directed against the institution of the recall of judges rather than against the reasoning of this case.

CORPORATION — DISTINCTION BETWEEN A CORPORATION AND ITS STOCKHOLDERS — DISREGARDING THE CORPORATE FICTION. — Under a railroad lien law a sub-contractor was required to give, within a specified period, notice of his intention to file a lien. No such notice was required of a contractor. The officers and directors of a corporation formed to operate a railroad, incorporated a construction company to build the line. The construction company contracted with the plaintiff to build the line. *Held*, that as to the railroad company, the plaintiff is the principal contractor. *Seymour v. Woodstock, etc. Co.*, 117 N. E. 729 (Ill.).

It is usually said that the corporate fiction will be disregarded when it is necessary to disregard it to prevent fraud or to attain a just result. *United States v. Milwaukee, etc. Co.*, 142 Fed. 247; *Bank v. Trebein*, 59 Ohio St. 316, 52 N. E. 834. See 1 MORAWETZ, CORPORATIONS, 2 ed., § 227; 3 COOK, CORPORATIONS, 7 ed., §§ 663, 664. Such a rule, it is submitted, is objectionable. It tends to loose and indefinite rules of law for business transactions. See *Gallagher v. Germania, etc. Co.*, 53 Minn. 214, 219, 54 N. W. 1115, 1116. It threatens the loss of valuable features of corporate organization. See *Moore, etc. Co. v. Towers, etc. Co.*, 87 Ala. 206, 212, 6 So. 41, 44. The rights of creditors may be affected by the rule. *In re Rieger*, 157 Fed. 609. The opinion in the principal case exemplifies the confusion which results from such a rule. The court speaks of looking "at the substance of things," and says that "consideration will not be given to corporate forms and fictions," and then decides the case upon the ground of agency. It is submitted that in most, if not all, of the cases in which the corporate fiction is disregarded the same result can be reached, as was reached in the principal case, upon legal principles which leave the separate corporate entity idea intact. *Cf. Bank v. Trebein, supra; Gonville's Trustee v. Patent Carmel Co.*, [1912] 1 K. B. 599. *Cf. also Beal v. Chase*, 31 Mich. 490; *Booth v. Seibold*, 37 Misc. (N. Y.) 101, 74 N. Y. Supp. 776.

CORPORATIONS — STOCKHOLDERS — LIABILITY ON STOCK IMPROPERLY ISSUED FOR SERVICES. — A promoter rendered services to a corporation. He